



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,049	05/11/2007	Andreas Ewald Bernard	W1.2331 PCT-US	2716
7590	06/16/2010	Douglas R. Hanscom Jones, Tullar & Cooper P.O.Box 226 Eads Station Arlington, VA 22202	EXAMINER CULLER, JILL E	
			ART UNIT 2854	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/16/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/587,049	BERNARD ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jill E. Culler	2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 69-134 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 69-134 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060724</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claims 69, 72, 73, 79, 88, 90, 94, 99-102 and 105-107 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 72 is dependent upon claim 20, which has been cancelled. Likewise, claim 73 is dependent upon claim 2, which has been cancelled. It appears that applicant intended both claims to depend from claim 71 and therefore, in the interests of furthering prosecution, they have been examined as such, however the claims must be amended.

Claim 79 is a double recitation of a folding blade cylinder which has already been recited in claim 69.

With respect to claims 90, 99-102, and 105-106 it is not clear that the specification teaches inking and dampening systems in the modules. These are not shown in the drawings and not clearly described in the specification. The claims have been examined, however applicant should clarify. In particular in claim 90, it is unclear whether the systems are mounted in said module or just held close to the module by the locks.

With respect to claim 94, the specification and drawings do not clearly describe a satellite cylinder in each of said modules.

With respect to claims 69, 88, 107, the recitation of a positionally controlled or positionally regulatable motor is unclear. The specification does not describe whether this motor is movable or what position might be used to regulate the motor. In the

interest of furthering prosecution, these claims have been examined to reflect a standard drive motor until further clarification is provided.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the subject matter of all of the claims, including claims 90, 94, 99-102 and 105-106 in particular, must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner,

the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,877,370 to Hantscho in view of EP 257390 to Kepert.

With respect to claims 69 and 79, Hantscho teaches a printing press comprising: at least first and second printing unit modules, each of said modules including at least one forme cylinder and at least one transfer cylinder, at least one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder in said first printing unit module having a first diameter, at least one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder in said second printing module having a second diameter different from said first diameter; each said printing unit module being usable to print a web of material in offset printing and having a variable print section length; a printing press frame adapted to selectively receive one of said at least first and second printing unit modules, said web to be inked by said printing press having said variable print section length in accordance with a selected one of said

Art Unit: 2854

at least first and second printing unit modules that is secured in said printing press frame.

Hantscho does not teach at least one folding apparatus in said printing press and having a folding apparatus section length which is changeable; at least one positionally regulatable drive motor usable to drive said at least one folding apparatus; means for separating said web into signatures having said variable print section lengths; and a folding blade cylinder in said at least one folding apparatus and having at least three signature leading end holding systems and at least three associated folding blades, a distance between each one of said associated holding systems and folding blades being changeable in accordance with said variable print section length.

Kepert teaches teach at least one folding apparatus for a printing press having a folding apparatus section length which is changeable; at least one positionally regulatable drive motor usable to drive said at least one folding apparatus; means for separating said web into signatures having said variable print section lengths; and a folding blade cylinder in said at least one folding apparatus and having at least three signature leading end holding systems and at least three associated folding blades, a distance between each one of said associated holding systems and folding blades being changeable in accordance with said variable print section length.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a folding apparatus, as taught by Kepert, in order to produce a cut and folded printed product.

With respect to claim 70, Kepert teaches that said means for separating said web includes at least one cutting cylinder pair forming a cutting gap through which said web passes.

With respect to claims 71-73, although Kepert does not explicitly teach that said cutting cylinder pair is driven at a preset speed which is independent of a web speed of said web, driven clocked in accordance with a clock rate of at least one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder in said printing unit, or driven at a pre-set ratio of a number of revolutions with respect to a number of revolutions of one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that the speed of the cutting cylinder must be related to the parameters of the printing press in order to produce a printed product which is sized appropriately and therefore these methods would have been obvious methods of achieving an appropriate speed.

With respect to claim 74, Kepert teaches a collection cylinder in said folding apparatus having two multi-armed instrument supports that are displaceable with respect to said other.

With respect to claim 80, Kepert teaches said folding apparatus is one of a variable 5:5 system or 7:7 system.

With respect to claim 82, Kepert teaches said printing unit is a web offset printing unit.

Art Unit: 2854

With respect to claim 84, Hantscho teaches each said printing unit module includes selectively interchangeable forme cylinders each having a diameter different from other ones of said selectively interchangeable forme cylinders.

With respect to claim 85, Hantscho teaches each said printing unit module includes selectively interchangeable transfer cylinders each having a diameter different from other ones of said selectively interchangeable transfer cylinders.

With respect to claims 86-87, although Hantscho does not explicitly teach the claimed cylinder circumferences, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that desirable cylinder circumferences would be directly related to the desired size of the printed pages and therefore would be a mere matter of functional choice having no patentable significance.

With respect to claim 88, Hantscho teaches a printing press comprising: at least one printing unit adapted to print a web of material in a printed section length that is variable and including a forme cylinder with a forme cylinder diameter and a transfer cylinder with a transfer cylinder diameter;

Hantscho does not teach at least one folding apparatus in said printing press and assigned to said at least one printing unit, said folding apparatus having a folded section length that is variable; a folding blade cylinder in said folding apparatus and including a holding system and a folding blade; at least one positionally controlled electric motor usable to drive at least one cylinder of said folding apparatus independently of said printing press; and a control device usable to set a distance between said holding

Art Unit: 2854

system and said folding blade of said folding blade cylinder as a function of said diameter of one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder by remote control.

Kepert teaches a folding apparatus having a folded section length that is variable; a folding blade cylinder in said folding apparatus and including a holding system and a folding blade; at least one positionally controlled electric motor usable to drive at least one cylinder of said folding apparatus independently of said printing press; and a control device usable to set a distance between said holding system and said folding blade of said folding blade cylinder by remote control.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a folding apparatus, as taught by Kepert, in order to produce a cut and folded printed product. Although Kepert does not explicitly teach the set distance is a function of said diameter of one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that this must be the case in order to maintain a useful size of folded product.

With respect to claims 90-91, Hantscho teaches a fitting system usable to secure said modules in said frame. Although Hantscho does not explicitly teach at least one of dampening systems and inking systems held in said module by pneumatic roller locks, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use any appropriate locking device to perform this function.

With respect to claims 97-98, Hantscho teaches a module transport system usable with said printing press for transporting a module to and from said frame, wherein said transport system is a crane.

With respect to claims 99-100, Hantscho teaches at least one inking system in each said modular printing unit and at least two inking system rollers in each said inking system.

With respect to claims 101-102, Hantscho teaches at least one dampening system in each said modular printing unit and at least two dampening system rollers in each said dampening system.

With respect to claim 110, although Hantscho and Kepert do not explicitly teach that said web of material has a width of greater than 2000 mm, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the width of the web of material would be dependent upon the size of the rest of the press and of the desired product and therefore would be a mere matter of functional choice having no patentable significance.

With respect to claims 111-112, Hantscho teaches four of said printing unit modules in said printing press, wherein said web of material is printed in several colors in said four printing unit modules.

With respect to claim 116, Hantscho teaches a web conditioning device in said printing press and usable to regulate at least one of web tension and web edges.

With respect to claims 117-118, Hantscho teaches a web drying installation in said printing press, wherein said web of material is dried in said drying installation after having been printed.

With respect to claim 121, Hantscho teaches one of a web draw-in device and a web cutting device in said printing press.

With respect to claim 127, Hantscho teaches at least one web interception device in said printing press.

With respect to claim 131, Kepert teaches said holding systems are one of gripper systems and spur needle systems.

With respect to claims 132-133, Hantscho teaches, in a first operational state, said transfer cylinder supports a first rubber blanket and has a first diameter, and in a second operational state said transfer cylinder supports a second rubber blanket and has a second diameter. Although Hantscho does not explicitly teach said first and second diameters differing by at least 5 mm or 10 mm, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art that desirable cylinder circumferences would be directly related to the desired size of the printed pages and therefore would be a mere matter of functional choice having no patentable significance.

With respect to claim 134, Kepert teaches a control system adapted to set said distance between said holding system and said associated folding blade. Although Kepert does not explicitly teach the set distance is a function of said diameter of one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder, it would have been obvious to one having

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that this must be the case in order to maintain a useful size of folded product.

Claims 75-77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,676,056 to Stein.

With respect to claims 75-76, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except that said positionally regulated drive motor for said folding apparatus is a servo motor and is independent of other functional elements of said printing press.

Stein teaches a folding unit having an independent motor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a servo motor, independent of other functions of the printing press, as taught by Stein, in order to more flexibly drive the folding system.

With respect to claim 77, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except that said folding apparatus includes a folding cylinder portion and a delivery cylinder portion each of which is driven independently of the other by a separate drive motor.

Stein teaches a folding unit having an independent motor.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a servo motor, independent of other functions of the printing press, as taught by Stein, in order to more flexibly drive the folding system and the delivery system.

Claim 78 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,689,041 to Lanvin et al.

With respect to claim 78, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except for a folding jaw cylinder, including springs, in said folding apparatus.

Lanvin et al. teaches a folding apparatus having a folding jaw cylinder, including springs, in said folding apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a folding jaw cylinder, as taught by Lanvin et al. in order to

Claims 81, 122-126, and 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-

88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,899,026 to Weis

With respect to claim 81, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except that said folding apparatus is a cover folding apparatus.

Weis teaches a folding apparatus which is a cover folding apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to fold a cover in addition to regular pages in order to assemble a printed article with a cover.

With respect to claims 122-126, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except for a web turning device in said printing press, at least one longitudinal web former in said printing press, at least one web gluing device in said at least one former and a superstructure system in said printing press.

Weis teaches a web turning device in said printing press, at least one longitudinal web former in said printing press, at least one web gluing device in said at least one former and a superstructure system in said printing press.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include said printing press features, as taught by Weis, in order to more effectively process the printed matter.

With respect to claim 130, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118,

121, 127, 131-134, except for a plurality of said printing presses, operable in parallel, and a common web folding apparatus.

Weis teaches a plurality of printing presses, operable in parallel, and a common web folding apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to have a plurality of presses, as taught by Weis, in order to print more pages simultaneously and assemble them in a common folding apparatus.

Claims 83 and 95-96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 5,718,172 to Ruckmann et al.

With respect to claim 83, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except said printing unit is a waterless offset printing unit.

Ruckman et al. teaches a waterless offset printing unit.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to act as a waterless offset printing unit in order to

Claims 81, 122-126, 130 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-

88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view With respect to claims 95-96, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except that said at least two modules can each be operable as an imprinter for a flying plate change.

Ruckmann et al. teaches printing units which are operable as an imprinter for a flying plate change.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to have printing units operate as imprinter units so that the printing process can be continued during a plate changing operation in order to improve printing efficiency.

Claims 89 and 94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 6,539,857 to Weschenfelder

With respect to claim 89, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except at least one of said forme cylinder and said transfer cylinder is adjustably seated on each said module.

Weschenfelder teaches cylinders which are adjustably seated in a movable printing unit module.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include adjustable cylinder seating, as taught by Weschenfelder, in order to be able to easily move the cylinders in the module with respect to one another.

With respect to claim 94, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except a satellite cylinder in each of said modules.

Weschenfelder teaches a movable printing unit module having a satellite cylinder.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a satellite cylinder configuration, as taught by Weschenfelder, in order to be able to print with four colors in a single printing unit.

Claim 92 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 6,612,234 to Hess.

With respect to claim 92, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118,

121, 127, 131-134, except a quick-release system usable for connecting said module to at least one of air supply and water supply and electrical supply in said frame.

Hess teaches a printing module connected to a frame using a quick release system for at least one of air supply, water supply and electrical supply.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a quick-release system, as taught by Hess, in order to be able to easily connect and disconnect the modules from the press.

Claims 93, 103 and 119 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 4,887,531 to Ichikawa et al.

With respect to claim 93, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except two forme cylinders and two transfer cylinders in each of said modules.

Ichikawa et al. teaches a printing press having printing modules with two forme cylinders and two transfer cylinders in each module.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include two forme cylinders

and two transfer cylinders in each module in order to be able to print on both sides of the web at the same time.

With respect to claim 103, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except at least one of inking systems and dampening systems in said printing press frame.

Ichikawa et al. teaches a printing press having removable modules and at least one of inking systems and dampening systems in said printing press frame.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to have inking and dampening systems in the printing press frame, as taught by Ichikawa et al. so that the removable modules can be smaller.

With respect to claim 119, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except a web cooling device in said web drying installation and adapted to cool said web of material.

Ichikawa et al. teaches a web cooling device.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a web cooling device, as taught by Ichikawa et al., in order to be able to bring the web back to a more manageable temperature after applying heat to dry the ink.

Claims 104-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. PGPUB 2004/0231536 to Gerner et al.

With respect to claims 104-107, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except for an independent drive mechanism for each of said one of inking systems and dampening systems in said printing press frame, or in said module wherein said independent drive motor is a positionally regulated electric motor.

Gerner et al. teaches a printing press having independent drive motors.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include independent drive motors, as taught by Gerner et al. in order to more flexibly control the drive of the press systems.

Claims 108-109 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 2,350,580 to Blackley et al.

With respect to claims 108-109, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-

118, 121, 127, 131-134, except that each said module has a closed oil chamber and said printing press frame has a closed oil chamber.

Blackley et al. teaches a closed oil chamber.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include closed oil chambers for the modules and the printing press frame in order to prevent leakage of the lubricating oil.

Claims 113-115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view GB 1375273 to Rombout

With respect to claims 113-115, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except a roll changer and roll support straps in said roll changer usable to support a roll of said material to be printed, wherein said roll support straps are driven by means of a drive mechanism.

Rombout teaches a roll changer having roll support straps in said roll changer usable to support a roll of said material to be printed, wherein said roll support straps are driven by means of a drive mechanism.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a roll changer

having roll support straps, as taught by Rombout, in order to more securely support the web rolls to be supplied to the printing press.

Claim 120 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,454 to Christmann et al.

With respect to claim 120, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, 131-134, except for a web dampening device in said web drying installation.

Christmann et al. teaches a web dampening device in a web drying installation.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a web dampening device in a web installation, as taught by Christmann et al., in order to better condition the web for folding and forming operations.

Claims 128-129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hantscho in view of Kepert as applied to claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-118, 121, 127, and 131-134 above, and further in view U.S. Patent No. 5,638,752 to Hartung et al.

With respect to claims 128-129, Hantscho and Kepert teach all that is claimed, as in the above rejection of claims 69-74, 79-80, 82, 84-88, 90-91, 97-102, 110-112, 116-

Art Unit: 2854

118, 121, 127, 131-134, except for at least one web coating device in said printing press, wherein said coating installation is usable for coating said web of material with a silicon layer.

Hartung et al. teaches at least one web coating device in a printing press usable for coating said web of material.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to further modify the apparatus of Hantscho to include a web coating device, as taught by Hartung et al. in order to add an additional coating to the printed product. Although Hartung et al. does not explicitly teach the coating is a silicon layer, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the web coating device of Hartung et al. is usable to apply a wide variety of well-known coatings including silicon.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jill E. Culler whose telephone number is (571)272-2159. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jec

/Jill E. Culler/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2854